

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added, cancelled or amended.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 10-12, 17, 21-26 and 32 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 6, 7, 10-12, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 09-205390 to Ozaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,525 to Tarusawa et al.; claims 17 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Tarusawa et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,630 to Langberg et al; claims 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0142699 to Jollota et al.; claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Jollota et al. and further in view of Langberg et al.; and claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozaki in view of Tarusawa et al. and further in view of Jollota et al. These rejections are traversed for the reasons given below.

The final Office Action correctly recognizes that Ozaki does not describe the claimed display content switch unit. However, the final Office Action incorrectly asserts that Tarusawa et al. teaches such features.

In more detail, the claimed display content switch unit is configured to **sequentially switch the display content by the display unit periodically**. Turning now to column 5, lines 29-67 and Figure 1A of Tarusawa et al., that portion of Tarusawa et al. merely describes switches SW1 and SW2 that are used to switch antennas A1 and A2 in and out periodically,

in order to provide a space diversity system. This portion of Tarusawa et al. is not at all directed to switching a display of a display unit, but rather it is directed to sequentially connecting two antennas to a band-pass filter system in order to achieve space diversity, in which nothing is to be displayed in the system of Tarusawa et al. Note that there a display unit is not included in the system shown in Figure 1A of Tarusawa et al.

On pages 4 and 5 of the final Office Action, it asserts that since the space diversity antenna system of Tarusawa et al. is very similar to the space diversity antenna system of Ozaki, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the switching mechanism of Tarusawa et al. to modify the system of Ozaki in order to display the completion report and correlation values of the received signal using the switching mechanism and select the desired diversity antenna based on the signal measurements. In reply, Ozaki does not teach or suggest displaying a correlation value, but rather it only describes a display that informs an operation that movement of an antenna is finished. See Abstract of Ozaki. The description in paragraph 0009 of Tarusawa et al. concerning the calculation of a correlation value is not made in reference to the display 12, and thus it is clear that Tarusawa et al. does not contemplate displaying the correlation value on the display 12.

Thus, at best, the combined teachings of Ozaki and Tarusawa et al. would teach that the system of Ozaki would also have a display for displaying when movement of the antennas has completed, but such a combined system would not display estimated correlation values, and such a combined system would not sequentially switch display content periodically.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is patentable over the combined teachings of Ozaki and Tarusawa et al.

Accordingly, independent claim 1, as well as its dependent claims 6, 7 and 21, are not anticipated by Ozaki.

Presently pending independent claims 12 and 17 recite similar features as discussed above with respect to claim 1, as method steps, whereby independent claims 12 and 17, as well as their respective dependent claims 23 and 25, are patentable over the cited art of record. It is also noted that neither Jollota et al. nor Langberg et al. (cited against other claims) rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Ozaki and Tarusawa et al.

With respect to independent claims 22, 24 and 26, those claims recite a sequential display on a display unit only in a numeric format and then only in a non-numeric format using light emitting diodes. Such features are not taught or suggested by Jollota et al., which merely discloses the use of LEDs to show a link quality as a “bar” on a display.

The final Office Action refers to Figure 4E of Jollota et al. to show a numeric format on a display and Figures 4A to 4D of Jollota et al. to show a non-numerical format in a display, but this does not meet the specific features recited in claims 22, 24 and 26, whereby a display unit sequentially displays only in a numeric format and then only in a non-numeric format using light emitting diodes. Rather, Figure 4E of Jollota et al. shows a different display embodiment than the ones shown in Figures 4A – 4D, whereby there is no teaching or suggestion that these different embodiments can be combined on a single display; rather, they are described as different implementations of how information is displayed and do not teach or suggest sequentially displaying a piece of information on a display first as a numeric format and then as a non-numeric format. Note the use of “alternative display embodiment” in paragraph 0039 of Jollota et al., which means a ‘substitute for’ and not to be used “together with.”

Accordingly, independent claims 22, 24 and 26 patentably distinguish over the combined teachings of Ozaki and Jollota et al.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claim 32, that claim recites additional features of the sequential display contents, in which the display content switch unit sequentially switches the display content by said display unit periodically by alternatively switching the display content between a first display content using only numeric values and a second display content using light emitting diodes. The final Office Action asserts that Jollota et al. teaches these features, but Applicants respectfully disagree.

Namely, Figure 4E of Jollota et al. shows a different display embodiment than the ones shown in Figures 4A – 4D, whereby there is no teaching or suggestion that these different embodiments can be combined on a single display; rather, they are described as different implementations of how information is displayed and do not teach or suggest sequentially displaying a piece of information on a display first as a numeric format and then

as a non-numeric format. Note the use of “**alternative** display embodiment” in paragraph 0039 of Jollota et al., which means a ‘substitute for’ and not to be used “together with.”

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the final Office Action have been addressed in this Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 26, 2009

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819